Negative contraction and Old English dialects: evidence from glosses and prose: part I

NEGATIVE CONTRACTION AND OLD ENGLISH DIALECTS: EVIDENCE FROM GLOSSES AND PROSE[1] PART I

Abstract

According to Levin (1958) negative contraction is much less regular in Anglian dialects of Old English than in West Saxon. More recently, Hogg (2004a) has argued that uncontracted forms were also frequent in at least one variety of West Saxon. Both claims rely on evidence taken from word-by-word glosses of Latin. However, no assessment of the evidence was done in either case to ensure that the observed patterns could not be due wholly or in part to the influence of Latin. The first part of this paper looks in detail at the data from glosses to determine to what extent they can be used as evidence for the behaviour of negative contraction in the varieties of Old English concerned. It will be seen that, despite indications of various degrees of Latin influence, the data from the Anglian glosses give sufficient grounds to support a conclusion that uncontracted forms are indeed more frequent in Anglian than in West Saxon, although some refinements are needed in relation to particular verb forms. In the case of Hogg's claim, on the other hand, it turns out that the observed pattern can be attributed entirely to the effect of Latin influence and/or copying from an exemplar.

Since evidence from glosses is not ideal, the second part of this paper explores whether data from prose can provide us with further evidence. The prose data show that there are some factors that promote the use of non-contraction in West Saxon. However, outside of those contexts, uncontracted forms in straightforwardly West Saxon texts are extremely rare, whereas they are not at all uncommon in texts that are thought to derive from an Anglian source, indicating that the uncontracted forms in such texts are almost certainly Anglian in origin.

1. Introduction

As is well-known, the negative particle *ne* 'not' may contract in Old English (OE) with a small group of verbs beginning with a vowel, /h/ or /w/. The verbs involved are *habban* 'have', *willan* 'want', *witan* 'know', the relevant forms of *beon* 'be', and *agan* 'owe', with negative contraction resulting in forms such as *næfde* (< *ne hæfde* 'not had'), *nis* (< *ne is* 'not is') and *nolde* (< *ne wolde* 'not wanted'). It will be clear that these verbs are mostly frequent—only *agan* is comparatively low-frequency. Warner (1993: 151) also notes that they all have auxiliary-like characteristics and/or belong to the preterite-present class of verbs, although not quite all verbs that fall into either of these categories allow negative contraction.

[1] A small start was made with the research presented here while I still held a British Academy Postdoctoral Fellowship at York; I gratefully acknowledge the financial support of the British Academy. Preliminary versions of parts of this material were presented at the Third York–Holland Symposium on the History of English Syntax and at the 14th International Conference on English Historical Linguistics. My thanks to the audiences present at these talks for their comments. I'm grateful to Rhona Alcorn, Fran Colman, Meg Laing and Roger Lass for their feedback on a complete draft. I'd also like to thank the anonymous reviewers of this paper and of an earlier version of the first half which appeared in *York Papers in Linguistics* for their comments and suggestions. All remaining shortcomings are of course entirely my own doing.

Richard Hogg gave me some general feedback on a draft of this paper and had intended to send more detailed comments at a later stage when he had had a chance to read it properly, but his untimely death intervened. I'm grateful to Margaret Hogg for sending me what annotations there were. Needless to say, the paper would have been the better for Richard's suggestions. Even without his full feedback, though, his influence and the debt I owe him for his inspirational teaching and research can be seen on every page. This paper is dedicated to his memory.

As pointed out by Hogg (2004a: 459), the most notable absentee from the set is *weorðan* 'become': it is a frequent verb with auxiliary-like uses overlapping with those of *beon* and it has the right phonological shape, yet it never contracts with *ne* in OE, even though as Levin (1958: 493) notes, negative contraction *is* found with its cognate *wertha* in Old Frisian (see Steller 1928: §27.3, Anm. 4).

Levin (1956, 1958) studied the frequency and distribution of negative contraction in medieval English, and he concluded that it could be used as a dialect criterion in both OE and Middle English (ME). This conclusion has been widely accepted. Indeed, Hogg (2004a: 475) refers to it as "one of the few, if not the only, clear instance of a syntactic dialect feature in early English". The evidence certainly looks solid for ME; in addition to Levin (1958), see Iyeiri (1992, 2001). The data given in these studies show that negative contraction is very rare to absent in Northern varieties of ME, and in East Midland varieties it is either variable or rare. This contrasts with Southern and West Midland dialects, where negative contraction is usually consistent, or nearly so, especially in texts from the earlier part of the period.[2] Admittedly, the situation is not as clear for Kentish. Levin (1958: 498 fn. 22) claims that it patterns with East Midland and Northern varieties, but according to Iyeiri (2001: 175), the evidence suggests that negative contraction is more usually the rule than the exception in Kentish. Overall, however, it is fair to say that there are marked differences in the frequency of negative contraction according to dialect in ME.

In the case of OE, the evidence also looks strong at first. According to Levin's (1958) data, negative contraction is found at a very high frequency in West Saxon (WS), whereas it is much more variable in Anglian dialects. The numbers found by Levin for OE, grouped by dialect, are given in Table 1. (I have added the percentages.) The data derive from material written before 1000 AD, with early WS predominating in the case of the WS data. As can be seen, the rate of contraction is very high indeed in WS—approaching 100%—whereas in both Mercian and Northumbrian (Nbr) a substantial proportion of the relevant forms is not contracted. On the basis of these data, Levin draws the conclusion that "in West Saxon the usage almost entirely favors contraction, whereas in Anglian uncontracted forms are freely employed" (1958: 495).

Table 1: data on negative contraction in OE dialects (Levin 1958: 495)

	contracted	uncontracted	% uncontracted
West Saxon	306	9	3%
Mercian	127	56	31%
Northumbrian	66	43	39%

Levin further supports his conclusion on the basis of additional evidence from the period of ca. 1000 AD until 1200 AD. As a result of the lack of surviving material from other dialects in this period, these data necessarily focus on WS. The numbers given by Levin have been collated in Table 2, below. They confirm his earlier conclusion about WS: uncontracted forms are normally very infrequent in the texts investigated. In the two cases where there are more than a handful of such forms, Levin can explain this without any modification of his claims. The uncontracted forms in the *Peterborough Chronicle* are all found in the interpolations or continuations, so they are representative of Anglian usage rather than WS, which means that uncontracted forms are to be expected in these parts of the text (Levin 1958: 498).[3] Similarly, the uncontracted forms found in the category labelled as 'Wulfstan' are all found in

[2] See Iyeiri (2001: 166–176) on diachrony as an additional factor in the frequency of negative contraction.

[3] Hogg (2004a: 460) in fact treats the data from the entire text as Anglian rather than WS, but this is problematic because the larger part of the text was copied from a WS exemplar.

texts for which Wulfstan's authorship has been disputed, and most of them occur in a single homily that has Anglian features (Levin 1958: 497). So in both cases, the increased use of uncontracted forms can be attributed to dialect since the texts involved were either written in an Anglian dialect or there is evidence to suggest that they derive from an Anglian source. In addition, the late date of the interpolations and continuations of the *Peterborough Chronicle* makes data taken from those parts of the text of doubtful relevance to any claims about OE; the language in those sections is more usually classified as transitional or early ME (East Midland dialect).

Table 2: negative contraction in the period ca. 1000 to 1200 (Levin 1958: 495–498)

	contracted	uncontracted	% uncontracted
Ælfric[4]	481	4	1%
Wulfstan	295	14	5%
WS Gospel of St. Matthew (Hatton ms.)	78	4	5%
Parker Chronicle	13	–	0%
Peterborough Chronicle	61	28	31%

The OE data given by Levin may look convincing, but there is a potential problem: Levin uses evidence taken from glosses and treats it as equivalent to data from prose. Moreover, all of the data for the Anglian dialects given in Table 1 were taken from glosses (the glosses to the *Gospel of St. Matthew* in the *Lindisfarne* and *Rushworth Gospels*, the *Vespasian Psalter and Hymns* gloss and the *Durham Ritual* gloss), whereas all the WS texts used in Levin's study are prose texts (*Orosius*, part of *Pastoral Care*, and the Corpus manuscript of the WS *Gospel of St. Matthew*, plus the material listed in Table 2). In other words, it is not at all clear that the data for Mercian and Nbr can safely be compared to those for WS since they have been drawn from different types of material, and it is uncertain to what extent influence from Latin might be responsible for the higher frequency of uncontracted forms found in the Mercian and Nbr glosses. Note that Mazzon (2004: 31) finds that non-contraction is noticeably more frequent in glosses than in the remainder of the extant OE corpus. As she adds, though, "this distinction intertwines with dialect distinction (several of the translations are from the north), which also appears to be an important factor", so that it is not obvious to what extent each of these two factors is responsible for the observed difference. Up to a point, the problem with the Anglian data is of course a problem not so much with Levin's study as with the extant OE material: there is not much surviving text written in Anglian dialects of OE and what there is consists almost entirely of glosses, so in a study of this kind there is little choice but to make use of glosses as a source of evidence. However, the potential impact on the data needs to be taken into account.

More recently, Hogg (2004a: 465–466) has argued that the *Salisbury Psalter* gloss provides evidence for the existence of a variety of WS in which negative contraction frequently fails to occur. Hogg is clearly aware that there could be interference from Latin, but instead of looking at the data carefully to assess how much of an impact influence from Latin is likely to have had, he simply assumes that the effect would not have been so strong that it could be solely responsible for the phenomenon, so that at worst it would have exaggerated the frequency of uncontracted forms to a limited extent. But it is not safe to make such assumptions without a more detailed study of the data.

[4] Levin appears to have included some material in this category which was not written by Ælfric: only specific parts of the translation of the *Heptateuch* have been attributed to Ælfric, and not quite all of the texts in volume I of the *Lives of Saints* (Skeat 1881, 1885) are believed to have been written by him.

Since the claims made so far about the dialectal distribution of negative contraction in OE are based on shaky foundations, this paper aims to remedy that situation by reassessing the available evidence. We will begin by taking a closer look at the data from glosses to try and determine to what extent the glossing process may have distorted the data and whether there is any safe evidence on negative contraction in the dialects concerned that we can extract from them. I will argue that it is very likely that influence from Latin has indeed affected the frequency of contraction to varying degrees in at least some of the Anglian glosses, but we will see that there is nevertheless enough evidence to support Levin's conclusion, albeit with some *caveats* as well as a few refinements relating to specific verb forms. In the case of the WS gloss used by Hogg (2004a), however, it turns out that the presence of a high number of uncontracted forms is almost certainly attributable entirely to the effects of glossing and/or copying.

Even though some of the glosses prove to be informative, it would be desirable to find additional evidence, ideally from prose material, to back up our conclusions.[5] An investigation of a wider range of prose texts might well yield further evidence on negative contraction in spite of the superficial lack of dialect variation in the extant corpus of OE prose, given that not all extant texts were originally written in WS and some preserve distinct non-WS characteristics in spite of the modification of their language towards WS norms. So after the evaluation of the data from glosses in section 2, we will move on to an investigation of a wide range of prose texts in section 3, using the York–Toronto–Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose (Taylor et al. 2003; from now on to be referred to as the YCOE), to see whether this yields any further evidence on the distribution of negative contraction in OE. We will find that the data from prose indeed support the claim that negative contraction was a dialect criterion already in OE. In addition, the data show that there is one morphological and one syntactic factor influencing the presence or absence of negative contraction in WS prose: person largely determines whether or not contraction occurs in the case of present tense singular forms of *beon*, and one specific construction, *hu ne*, allows or even forces the use of uncontracted forms in cases where such forms are otherwise rare or absent. There may also be a lexical factor involved, in that the limited data on *agan* contained in the YCOE provide no evidence that lack of contraction is linked to Anglian dialects in the case of this particular verb.

2. Evidence from glosses

2.1. The use of glosses as evidence and some notes on methodology

For most linguistic purposes, glosses are obviously less than ideal sources of evidence. The problem is normally not too severe for phonology; it is unlikely that any significant distortion of the spelling has been caused by the fact that the OE gloss normally consists of word-by-word translations of Latin. Also, a smaller amount of text often suffices for the collection of enough data, so the relatively small amount of non-WS material is less of an obstacle to the study of dialectal variation in the case of phonology. Things become more difficult with morphology, but glosses still often contain valuable evidence, provided that they are used

[5] Although there is some material in the corpus of OE poetry that appears to be purely Anglian in character, it is not much. Also, poetry has the complicating factor of metre. Specifically, the demands of metre may force the use of a contracted or non-contracted form. In addition, there have been claims that there are syntactic conditions on negative contraction at work in the poetry (Blockley 1988, 1990, 2001), although I should point out that these claims have been subject to fairly extensive criticism (Mitchell & Irvine 1992, 1996 and Jack 1999). Because of the limited data and the potentially interfering factors, evidence from OE poetry is unlikely to help us much further with the issue of negative contraction as a dialect criterion. Therefore data from poetry will not be investigated here. For a discussion of negative contraction in OE poetry, see Fulk (1992: ch. 3).

with care. For syntax, however, both the quantity and the quality of the surviving non-WS material pose very serious problems for any investigation into possible dialect differences during the OE period. A larger amount of text is usually needed to permit reasonably confident conclusions about syntax. In addition, the procedure of slavishly following a Latin original will in most cases have distorted the syntax to such an extent that data from glosses simply cannot be used. The latter point will be especially clear in the case of word order, since in glosses it normally mirrors that of the Latin.

This is not to say that glosses should automatically be dismissed as potential sources of evidence for syntax. See for example Kroch & Taylor (1997: 320–322) for an attempt to use glosses to obtain data on the properties of verb second in northern dialects of OE by focusing on instances where the Latin cannot be held responsible for the word order found in the OE gloss.[6] Similarly, Eythórsson (1995: ch. 1) uses glosses as a source of evidence for syntactic properties of Gothic by looking at mismatches between the Greek original and the Gothic gloss. But it certainly cannot be taken for granted that it is safe to use them in the way that Levin appears to have done. Even though glosses had to be used, it is still necessary to ask whether some of the patterns observed in the data on negative contraction for Mercian and Nbr could be due to the fact that the data were taken from glosses. Indeed, given that all of Levin's data for WS derive from prose and all the Anglian data from glosses, it is even conceivable that the observed difference between Anglian and WS is entirely an artefact of the data. Without looking into the issue further, we simply cannot assess the value of the data he presents. Similarly, Hogg's claim that not all varieties of WS in fact avoided uncontracted forms cannot be accepted unless we can show that the uncontracted forms cannot be attributed purely to the effects of glossing.

It may not be immediately obvious why the glossing process might have distorted the data on negative contraction. The phenomenon is arguably on the boundary with morphology rather than being straightforwardly syntactic, and the two variants do not differ in the ordering of the negative marker and the verb. However, the use of an uncontracted form might have been encouraged in cases where the corresponding Latin had *non* 'not' followed by a separate verb form, as has also been pointed by both López-Couso (2002, 2006: 178) and Hogg (2004a: 466), although neither discusses it in relation to Levin's data. In such cases, *ne* + verb would give the closest OE equivalent to what is found in the Latin, with a separate gloss for each lexical item. In other words, uncontracted forms could have been created as a by-product of a very strict word-by-word glossing procedure even if such forms did not normally occur in the variety of OE concerned. Similarly, if uncontracted forms existed as a variant in the glossator's language, the glossing process could have led to an increased use of them. This is not to say that glossing must necessarily have had such an effect. It is not clear whether glossators strived for exact one-to-one matching of words in all cases, and it certainly is not clear that *all* glossators would have done so—there is a range of glossing practice from the very literal and mechanical to comparatively free glosses that may contain even deviations from the Latin word order so that they arguably shade into the territory of translations. But some such effect might well have occurred, even if the extent of it may have varied from gloss to gloss.

The opposite effect may also have affected the data: in the case of forms of the verbs *nolle* 'not want' and *nescire* 'not know', Latin has negative contraction itself. In those cases, contraction might have been favoured in the OE gloss. Similarly, the use of a single word in

[6] There may be a problem with Kroch & Taylor's data because none of the examples they give in the article are actually cast-iron instances of the construction they are looking for (see van Bergen 2003: 208–209 for details), but that does not detract from their imaginative use of glosses to try and uncover evidence for a phenomenon in a dialect for which virtually no other type of evidence is available, nor does it call into question the validity of using this type of evidence in principle.

the case of, for example, Latin *ignorare* 'not know' could have encouraged the use of contraction in the OE gloss when a negated form of *witan* was used to gloss this verb. So if glossing practice influenced the frequency of contraction, it would not necessarily have led to an overall increase in the use of uncontracted forms; that would have depended on which verbs were being glossed and in what numbers. Consequently, it is essential to keep the data on the different verbs separate. If there was a skewing effect as a result of glossing, we would expect it to have increased the proportion of uncontracted forms in the case of *beon* and *habban*, where typically the corresponding Latin had *non* + verb, but it should have led to a *de*creased use of uncontracted forms for *willan* and *witan*.[7]

To assess whether such a skewing effect is likely to have affected Levin's data, I have collected the relevant forms from the glosses he used in his study, except that I have used all of the *Lindisfarne Gospels* rather than just *Matthew*. The data collection was done using the Dictionary of Old English Corpus (Cameron et al. 1981).[8] In addition, I have checked the Nbr parts of the *Rushworth Gospels* for differences as compared to *Lindisfarne*. The Nbr data are discussed in section 2.2, while section 2.3 deals with Mercian. Similarly, I have collected data from the *Salisbury Psalter* gloss and other psalter glosses, again using the Dictionary of Old English Corpus, to assess Hogg's claim that *Salisbury* provides us with evidence that not all varieties of WS showed an overwhelming preference for negative contraction. Those data are discussed in section 2.4.

The data throughout have been limited to finite verb forms, since *ne* is not normally found with non-finite verbs except in very specific circumstances.[9] It should be noted, however, that negative contraction is nevertheless sometimes found with non-finite verb forms, presumably indicating a degree of lexicalisation of the contracted form; five such forms occur in *Lindisfarne*, one in the *Durham Ritual* and one in the *Vespasian Psalter* gloss, all involving the present participle of *habban*. I have excluded any instances of *ne* followed by a finite verb form which are likely to involve the coordinator *ne* 'nor' rather than the negative particle *ne* 'not'. All cases where the <e> of the negator is present have been treated as uncontracted, including when the <e> is written above or below the line;[10] where it is absent, they have been treated as contracted, including occasional forms like <nwilt> and <nuill>.[11] In the case of *Lindisfarne*, <neam> is consequently treated as uncontracted, given that <eam> is not found for the 1sg present form of *beon* in *Lindisfarne* (nor is <eom>) and the normal form in this gloss is <am>. In the case of *Vespasian*, on the other hand, <neam> is treated as

---

[7] *Agan* will be ignored in this part of the paper. I have found no negated instances of this verb in any of the glosses investigated.

[8] The corpus was obtained from the Oxford Text Archive. It is an untagged corpus, so the searches had to rely on identifying all potential forms concerned. Given the extent of the spelling variation, it is possible that some forms have been missed. However, the fact that the total numbers are normally close to or higher than those found by Levin indicate that it is unlikely any such omissions involve more than a few instances. Cross-checking with indexes/glossaries for the glosses in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* (Ross & Stanley 1960), the *Durham Ritual* (Ross & Stanley 1969) and the *Vespasian Psalter and Hymns* (Grimm 1906) has also minimised the possibility of oversights.

[9] In two particular syntactic contexts *ne* may precede an infinitive (Mitchell 1985: §916, §1602, van Bergen 2004).

[10] Ross & Squires (1980: 490) regard superscript letters in *Lindisfarne* as "alternatives" rather than corrections since they often involve alternations, although they admit it is difficult to establish how the glossator thought of them. There are not many forms in our data set that involve superscript <e>; according to the information given in Ross & Stanley (1960), there are three each for *beon* and *witan* plus the excluded form of *witan* mentioned in fn. 11, so treating them as alternations rather than corrections would not have much of an impact on the data.

[11] MkGl (Li) 11.33 *n^{e}utu* and MtHeadGl (Li) 82 *neuton* have been excluded because it is not entirely clear whether they should be regarded as contracted or uncontracted. Forms beginning with <ut> (rather than <uut>) do not occur as forms of *witan* elsewhere in *Lindisfarne*, so it is not completely certain that these instances can safely be treated as uncontracted, even though it seems quite unlikely that a contracted form *witan* would have a vowel of a kind that might be represented by <eu>.

contracted, since here <eam> is the normal 1sg present form of *beon* whereas <am> is not found.

2.2. The data from Northumbrian glosses

The two Nbr glosses used in Levin's study are the *Lindisfarne Gospels* gloss and the *Durham Ritual* gloss. Both glosses date from the second half of the 10th century. The *Durham Ritual* gloss, dating from around 970, is the later of the two. These glosses were both written by a scribe named Aldred based at Chester-le-Street, and the current consensus is that the scribe was the same person in both cases.[12] Despite this, I have kept the data for the two glosses separate. Marked differences between the two can be found for at least some features, as shown by Lindelöf's (1901) data on the orthographical representation of a particular vowel, discussed in Hogg (2004b: 246), as well as Ross's (1978) study of lexical differences between the two. Therefore it cannot automatically be assumed that they will always pattern in the same way linguistically. Indeed, the same appears to hold for different parts of the *Lindisfarne* gloss (see especially Brunner 1947/48), so we also need to check for any marked differences within *Lindisfarne*, the more so given that Ogura's data (1999: 140) indicate that the gloss to *Luke* has an increased use of uncontracted forms compared to the other three gospels.

The discussion of the evidence from the Nbr glosses is structured as follows. The data from *Lindisfarne* are dealt with in section 2.2.1, starting with the OE data (section 2.2.1.1), followed by a more detailed look at the interaction with Latin (section 2.2.1.2) and finishing with a discussion of the implications of the variation found within the *Lindisfarne* gloss (section 2.2.1.3). We will see that the data are difficult to assess because of the likelihood of some degree of influence from Latin and the further complications caused by differences between sections of the gloss. However, the influence from Latin appears to have been limited, and there is sufficient evidence to support a conclusion that uncontracted forms occurred more freely here than in WS, even if it is impossible to determine the precise frequencies of negative contraction for the dialect spoken by the glossator. Section 2.2.2 discusses the data from the *Durham Ritual* gloss. We will find that they look similar to those from *Lindisfarne* (or at least most parts of it). In section 2.2.3 I give a brief summary of the findings based on the evidence from those two glosses. Finally, section 2.2.4 looks at the third source of substantial length for Nbr, i.e. the Nbr part of the *Rushworth Gospels* gloss (*Rushworth*^{2}), which Levin did not use in his study. We will see that little more evidence can be obtained from this particular source because of its status as a copy from *Lindisfarne* together with a strong tendency to match Latin *non* to OE *ne* in those cases where it diverges from *Lindisfarne*.

2.2.1. The Lindisfarne Gospels *gloss*

2.2.1.1 The Old English data

The data on negative contraction for the whole of the *Lindisfarne* gloss are given in Table 3, below. Notice that in *Lindisfarne*, it is quite common for words to be given several possible glosses. In cases where both the contracted and the uncontracted variant are given as alternative glosses for a single instance in the Latin, both variants have been included in the counts.[13] Table 4 gives the data for different parts of the gloss. The percentages have been italicised in this Table when N<10. All of the *Lindisfarne* gloss has been included in Table 4, so 'Matthew' for example consists of everything until the end of *Matthew* rather than just the *Gospel according to Matthew*. Brunner (1947/48) found a marked change in linguistic properties at around *Mark* 5.40, so *Mark* has been subdivided into two sections accordingly.

[12] See Brown (1969) for discussion and further references on these matters.
[13] This happens in three cases for *beon*, four cases for *habban* and three for *witan*.

Table 3: negative contraction in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* gloss

	contracted	uncontracted	% uncontracted
beon	49	99	67%
habban	23	41	64%
willan	90	13	13%
witan	40	21	34%

Table 4: negative contraction in different sections of *Lindisfarne*

	beon		*habban*		*willan*		*witan*	
	contr.	uncontr.	contr.	uncontr.	contr.	uncontr.	contr.	uncontr.
Matthew	13 (37%)	22 (63%)	9 (41%)	13 (59%)	38 (97%)	1 (3%)	10 (71%)	4 (29%)
Mk < 5.40	4 *(50%)*	4 *(50%)*	4 *(67%)*	2 *(33%)*	3 *(100%)*	– *(0%)*	– *(0%)*	1 *(100%)*
Mk ≥ 5.40	– (0%)	15 (100%)	1 *(25%)*	3 *(75%)*	5 *(71%)*	2 *(29%)*	2 *(33%)*	4 *(67%)*
Luke	2 (6%)	29 (94%)	– (0%)	13 (100%)	26 (74%)	9 (26%)	1 *(20%)*	4 *(80%)*
John	30 (51%)	29 (49%)	9 (47%)	10 (53%)	18 (95%)	1 (5%)	27 (77%)	8 (23%)

Table 3 shows that there is a clear difference between *beon* and *habban* on the one hand, where uncontracted forms predominate—about two thirds of instances—and *willan* and *witan* on the other, where contracted forms make up the majority of instances (very clearly so in the case of *willan*). This may of course reflect real differences between the lexical items concerned. After all, there is no good reason for assuming that the rate of contraction would necessarily have been the same for all four verbs. Indeed, the difference between *willan* and *witan* seems to suggest that the rates of contraction may well have varied. However, there are other factors which might be at least partly responsible for the attested difference between those two verbs. Although Latin *nescire* and *nolle* both have negative contraction, *nescire* is still transparently analysable as a negative element, i.e. *ne*, and the verb *scire* 'know', whereas the same is not true for *nolle*. This means that the use of contracted forms might have been more strongly encouraged in glosses of *nolle* than in those of *nescire*. There is also more variation in what the negated forms of *witan* gloss. Negated forms of *willan* gloss forms of *nolle* with relatively few exceptions, but for *witan* there are a non-negligible number of instances that gloss something other than *nescire*. Most significantly, this includes nine instances that involve the use of *non* followed by a verb meaning 'know', which consequently may have encouraged the use of uncontracted forms in the gloss; we will come back to this in section 2.2.1.2. In addition, *willan* frequently occurs in the gloss of one particular construction—negative commands/exhortations in the form of imperative *nolite* (plural) or *noli* (singular) plus an infinitive—and the recurrent pattern may have led to less variation in the gloss used.

To explore the potential impact of this last factor a bit further, let us look at the data for *willan* more closely. If they are restricted to glosses of the *noli(te)* construction, the frequency of uncontracted forms for this verb drops further, to 5% (4 out of 74). Conversely, the rate of uncontracted forms goes up to 31% (9 out of 29) if glosses of that particular construction are excluded. In other words, the near-consistent use of contracted forms in glosses of the frequent *noli(te)* construction may be inflating the frequency of contraction with *willan*, so the difference between *witan* and *willan* may not be as big as it seems at first. These percent-

ages may be somewhat misleading, though. Table 4 shows that uncontracted forms are not spread evenly through the gloss, and in the case of *willan* they are rare outside of the parts that show an increased use of uncontracted forms (*Luke* and *Mark* from 5.40), whereas uncontracted forms of *witan* are not unusual outside of those parts. If we exclude *Luke* and the relevant section of *Mark*, then we find no uncontracted forms at all in glosses of the *noli(te)* construction, but the frequency of uncontracted forms of *willan* in other contexts also drops back down to 11% (2 out of 19), which is again lower than what we find for *witan* in the same parts of *Lindisfarne* (13 out of 50, or 26%). In *Luke*, on the other hand, the behaviour of *willan* falls in line with the other verbs if glosses of *noli(te)* are excluded. As can be seen from Table 4, there are no contracted forms in *Luke* for *habban* at all, and just two for *beon* and one for *witan*. In contrast, contracted forms predominate in the case of *willan*, even if it does have nine out of the thirteen uncontracted forms found in the entire gloss so that it still has an increased use of non-contraction as compared to the rest of the gloss, with the possible exception of *Mark* from 5.40. If we exclude glosses of the *noli(te)* construction, however, there is just a single contracted form of *willan* in *Luke* compared to six uncontracted ones, i.e. uncontracted forms become the norm for this verb as well in that case.[14]

Glosses of the highly frequent *noli(te)* plus infinitive construction, then, may be skewing the data for *willan*, exaggerating the frequency of contracted forms for this verb, but it is not clear that this can account fully for the difference between *witan* and *willan* when the variation between different parts of the gloss is taken into account. Even allowing for the possibility of some genuine differences in the frequency of negative contraction between the four verbs involved, however, it is striking that the two verbs where the rate of non-contraction is higher normally gloss two Latin words (*non* + verb), whereas the two verbs where the rate of non-contraction is lower are precisely the two verbs which usually gloss a single word in the Latin. Low numbers admittedly make some of the percentages quite unreliable in the case of certain subsections, but the generalisation appears to hold for all parts of the gloss (ignoring *witan* in the section of *Mark* before 5.40; it contains just a single form, which happens to be uncontracted). That suggests the glossing process could well be interfering. If such interference indeed occurred, then we are overestimating the rate of non-contraction for *beon* and *habban*, and underestimating it for *willan* and *witan*.

Another thing that will be clear from Table 3 is that even the lowest rate of non-contraction, i.e. that for *willan*, is still well above the 3% rate found for WS by Levin (1958), in spite of the fact that the Latin may well have encouraged the use of contracted rather than uncontracted forms of this verb. If we focus on just the parts of *Lindisfarne* that do not have an increased frequency of uncontracted forms, the overall rate of non-contraction of *willan* (2 out of 61, i.e. 3%) does drop down to the level that Levin found for WS. However, we will see in the discussion of the YCOE data in section 3 that Levin was including forms and contexts that promote the use of non-contraction in WS. Outside of those circumstances, the use of uncontracted forms in straightforwardly WS material turns out to be vanishingly rare (arguably unattested in the case of *willan*, at least in the YCOE), so even Levin's 3% is actually overestimating the frequency of non-contraction in WS. Things are even clearer in the case of *witan*. Here too, Latin influence would have led to an increased use of contracted forms if anything, and yet uncontracted forms are common in all parts of *Lindisfarne*. In other words, while it may not be possible to give a very accurate estimate of the frequency of non-contraction in the variety or varieties of Nbr represented in this gloss on the basis of the data we have, it is safe to conclude that it was more frequent than in WS.

[14] *Mark* ≥ 5.40 has just two uncontracted forms, one of which is a gloss of *noli(te)*, and only three forms of *willan* glossing a different construction (two contracted, one uncontracted), so here excluding glosses of *noli(te)* has little effect, but the numbers involved are extremely low.

2.2.1.2 A more detailed look at interaction with Latin

A closer look at the interaction with Latin confirms that, whatever the effect may have been, it is certainly not the case that one word in the Latin consistently leads to use of contraction in *Lindisfarne*, nor does expression of negation by the use of a separate word in the Latin necessarily give rise to uncontracted forms in the OE gloss. Mismatches can be found in either direction, as can be seen in the examples given in (1) and (2), and at least in the case of *beon*, *habban* and *witan*, they are quite common. The occasional use of both forms as alternatives, as in (3), also suggests that both variants were acceptable; examples of this are found with all verbs concerned except *willan*. In addition, there are cases where the gloss does not match the Latin precisely, but it is often difficult to predict what effect that would have had on the use of negative contraction. In (4) and (5), for example, the use of *non* could have encouraged the use of *ne* in the gloss (i.e. an uncontracted form), but equally the absence of a word in the Latin corresponding to *is* could have encouraged the use of a contracted form. As can be seen from the examples, both variants are found in such cases as well.

(1) a. . . . nam ic wyrðe . . . (OE) \ non sum dignus (Lat.)
not-am I worthy not am worthy
'I am not worthy'
(MtGl (Li) 3.11)[15]

b. . . . nallas gie . . . (OE) \ non uultis (Lat.)
not-want you not want-2pl
'you do not want'
(JnGl (Li) 5.40)

(2) a. . . . ne wuton (OE) \ nesciunt (Lat.)
not know not-know
'do not know'
(LkGl (Li) 11.44)

b. ne wællas gefrohtiga . . . (OE) \ nolite expauescere (Lat.)
not want to-fear not-want to-fear
'do not (want to) be afraid'
(MkGl (Li) 16.6)

(3) a. ne habbas *vel* nabbas . . . (OE) \ non habent (Lat.)
not have *or* not-have not have
'do not have'
(MtGl (Li) 14.16)

b. . . . nutige *vel* ne wutige . . . (OE) \ nescitis (Lat.)
not-know-you *or* not know-you not-know-2pl
'do you not know'
(MtGl (Li) 24.42)

(4) a. . . . ne is un-cynn . . . (OE) \ non inmerito (Lat.)
not is improper not unjustifiedly
'is not improper'
(LkArgGl (Li) 7)

[15] The system of reference for the location of cited examples adopted throughout this paper is the one used in the Dictionary of Old English Corpus. Details can be found in Healey & Venezky (1980 [1985]).

b. nis geafo (OE) \ non sacrificium[16] (Lat.)
not-is gift not sacrifice
'(it) is not a sacrifice'
(MtGl (Li) 9.13)

(5) a. . . . ne is gelefed . . . (OE) \ non licet (Lat.)
not is allowed not may
'is not allowed'
(MtGl (Li) 14.4)

b. . . . nis gelefed . . . (OE) \ non licet (Lat.)
not-is allowed not may
'is not allowed'
(MtGl (Li) 12.2)

Looking at the interaction with Latin in the case of *witan* specifically may help us further in determining whether Latin influence is likely to have skewed the data, and if so, to what extent. As mentioned earlier, a number of instances in fact gloss *non* followed by a verb (*scire* or *noscere*, both meaning 'know') rather than a form of *nescire* or *ignorare*. If the frequency of contraction was influenced by the Latin, we would expect to see some difference between the two groups. This may indeed be the case. As can be seen in Table 5, the contracted form is given as the sole gloss in only three instances out of the nine cases that gloss *non* + verb. So here the contracted form—elsewhere clearly the preferred form—is used in a minority of cases as the sole form in the gloss, although it is still given at least as an option (i.e. sole gloss or alternate) in six out of nine of the glosses. In five out of nine cases, i.e. more than 50% of the time, the uncontracted form is at least given as a possibility. Compare this to glosses of forms of *nescire* or *ignorare*, where the uncontracted form of *witan* is found as a possibility in 16 out of 45 instances (i.e. about a third), while the contracted form is used in the majority of cases as the sole gloss (25 out of 45).

Table 5: negative contraction with *witan* when glossing Latin forms with and without *non*

	glosses of *non* + verb	glosses of *nescire*/*ignorare*
contracted	3	25
uncontracted	2	15
both forms given as alternates	2	1
contracted + form of *ne cunnan*	1	4
uncontracted + form of *ne cunnan*	1	–

The difference between the two sets of data increases if we exclude *Luke* and the second section of *Mark*. We have seen that these parts have a higher frequency of uncontracted forms in general, and all but one of the negated forms of *witan* contained in them gloss *nescire*/*ignorare* rather than *non* + verb, so they may be skewing the data by inflating the number of uncontracted forms glossing *nescire*/*ignorare*. Table 6 gives the numbers excluding those parts. As can be seen, the only change for glosses of *non* + verb is that the instance with an uncontracted form of *witan* and a form of *ne cunnan* disappears, but there are more extensive changes to the numbers for glosses of *nescire*/*ignorare*. The biggest drop is in the number of glosses that consist of an uncontracted form of *witan*, which goes down from 15 to 8. Since

[16] An anonymous reviewer points out that the use of *nis* here and in MtGl (Li) 12.7 (glossing an identical Latin phrase) is unusual: it glosses *non* introducing the rejected option of two coordinated direct objects. Compare *Rushworth*[1], where the negative adverbs *nalles* and *no* are used instead.

the number of glosses that involve a contracted form (as sole gloss or alternate) is only reduced from 30 to 27, this means that the preference for contracted forms in the case of glosses for *nescire*/*ignorare* becomes somewhat more pronounced.

Table 6: negative contraction with *witan* when glossing Latin forms with and without *non*, excluding the data from *Luke* and *Mark* < 5.40

	glosses of *non* + verb	glosses of *nescire*/*ignorare*
contracted	3	23
uncontracted	2	8
both forms given as alternates	2	1
contracted + form of *ne cunnan*	1	3
uncontracted + form of *ne cunnan*	–	–

The numbers for negated forms of *witan* glossing *non* + verb are unfortunately too low to allow any safe conclusions—the apparent difference could be due to chance—but these data still suggest that the Latin is likely to have exerted some degree of influence on the use of contracted or uncontracted forms in the OE gloss. However, they also indicate that, if there was such an effect, it was limited. If we calculate the percentage of uncontracted forms of *witan* for glosses of *nescire*/*ignorare* and *non scire*/*non noscere* in the same way as in the main data in section 2.2.1.1, we get 35% (16 out of 46) and 45% (5 out of 11) respectively for the whole gloss, and 25% (9 out of 36) compared to 40% (4 out of 10) when *Luke* and the second section of *Mark* are excluded.[17] So there may well have been some skewing of the data, but it does not appear to have been extreme. Once we take into account that for glosses of *non scire*/*non noscere* any skewing would have gone in the opposite direction from those of *nescire*/*ignorare*, it seems fairly unlikely that it involved much more than an over- or underestimation (depending on whether the Latin encouraged or discouraged the use of uncontracted forms) of the 'real' frequency of uncontracted forms by about 10% in the case of *witan*.

As indicated earlier, we cannot exclude the possibility that the Latin may have had a weaker influence in some cases than others, notably in the case of glosses of *nescire* against those of *nolle*. So in an ideal world we would of course do this type of exercise for all four verbs to try and gauge the likely degree of influence for each of them. Unfortunately we do not have comparable subsets of data for the other verbs that allow us to do so. Even in the case of *witan* we have less than we would ideally need. That means that in the case of *beon* and *habban*, where all uncontracted forms involve glosses of Latin *non* (nearly always followed by a form of *esse* or *habere*), it is difficult to completely exclude the possibility that most or all of these forms might be the result of Latin influence. However, on the basis of the evidence we have seen, it looks highly unlikely. In the case of *willan*, on the other hand, I think there is a bigger chance that the uncontracted forms found outside of *Luke* and the second section of *Mark* might be the result of Latin influence; there are only two such instances (MtGl (Li) 24.43 and JnGl (Li) 8.24), and both involve Latin *non*. This is not to say, of course, that Latin influence must necessarily have been responsible for those forms, or that even if it was, it would entail that we are dealing with a variety of Nbr that had consistent contraction in the case of *willan*; Latin influence of contracted *nolle* together with the effect of the frequent *noli(te)* construction may of course be hiding the existence of variation. In the

[17] The excluded forms *n^{e}utu* and *neuton* (see fn. 11 above) both gloss forms of *nescire*. One occurs in the part of the gloss with a higher frequency of uncontracted forms (specifically, the second section of *Mark*), the other one does not. If they are included in the counts, the difference between the two groups becomes even smaller (38% vs. 45% for the whole gloss, and 27% vs. 40% for the parts excluding *Luke* and the second section of *Mark*). Of course, the overall frequency of uncontracted forms would go up a bit as well in that case.

case of *Luke* and the second section of *Mark*, however, we can dispense with any doubts over the availability of uncontracted forms of *willan*: only one of the eleven uncontracted forms found in these parts involves Latin *non* (LkGl (Li) 12.39), while the remaining ten gloss forms of *nolle*.

2.2.1.3 Implications of the variation between different parts of Lindisfarne

It is clear from the data that there are parts of *Lindisfarne* where uncontracted forms are much more common than others. This holds especially for *Luke*, where we have seen that contracted forms are rare except in the case of glosses of *noli(te)* plus infinitive. The starting point of this shift may coincide with the point identified by Brunner (1947/1948), i.e. *Mark* 5.40. That certainly matches what happens with *beon*, although it is not certain whether the two parts of *Mark* differ in the case of the other verbs; the numbers are too low to permit firm conclusions for those. But even if there is a general change at this point, there is certainly no neat division of *Lindisfarne* into two (i.e. before and after *Mark* 5.40). Notice that *John* does not have an increased frequency of uncontracted forms—the reverse, if anything. This contrasts with at least two of the features discussed by Brunner, where one of the variants simply ceases to occur after *Mark* 5.40. On the other hand, there are other changes at the start of *John*, most notably the use of <v> instead of <u>, that lead Ross et al. (1960: 23) to suggest that the main division in the gloss is in fact at the end of *Luke*, so the change in the use of negative contraction at this point is not an isolated one. See also Elliott & Ross (1972) for an extended discussion of linguistic differences between *John* and the remainder of the gloss.

Clearly, then, there are differences between different parts of *Lindisfarne* and this holds for the use of negative contraction as well. It is far less certain what those differences mean. *Lindisfarne* is notorious for the degree of the variation found within it, and it is not clear whether the *Lindisfarne* scribe changed his practice or whether we are more likely to be dealing with a change of scribes in an exemplar. (Paleographers no longer believe in a change of scribe in *Lindisfarne* itself.) The extent of the difference we find here might seem to argue in favour of Brunner's view that several scribes were involved.[18] If so, there would have been at least two changes of scribe in the exemplar—one around *Mark* 5.40 and one around the beginning of *John*—and in view of Brunner's evidence, the final scribe would not have been the same as the first. However, the evidence is not clear-cut on the issue of sharp change or more gradual change between the different parts, and while the former would suggest a change of scribe in an exemplar, the latter would be more consistent with a change in practice of the same scribe. In some cases there may be an abrupt shift, but according to Elliott & Ross (1972: 65), who think that the gloss to *John* in *Lindisfarne* is a copy of one made by Bede and therefore believe in a change of (scribe in the) exemplar at this point, the transition from <w> to <u> at the beginning of *John* is actually gradual, so they conclude that this particular change was actually made by Aldred. Given the extent of the variation in the gloss—not just linguistic, but also found "with almost the same superabundance, in the paleography" (Ross et al. 1960: 22), which is difficult to attribute to a change of scribe in an exemplar—any attempt to settle the issue would require a comprehensive study. Consequently, I will suspend judgement.

Whatever the precise cause of the changes was, notice that uncontracted forms become more frequent with all four verbs in the relevant part and then drop again for all in *John*, so it does not look as if the difference is the result of a change in the degree of influence that the Latin had; that type of change would have affected *beon* and *habban* differently from *witan* and *willan* rather than leading to an overall increase or decrease in the use of the uncontracted

[18] If the change in the case of some verbs is more gradual, that would of course argue in the opposite direction. *Witan* is a potential candidate for this, but as said earlier, the numbers are simply too low to permit conclusions either way.

variant. So it looks like something that reflects the use of negative contraction in the variety or varieties of OE concerned. In other words, the data suggest that we at least need to allow for the possibility of the existence of varieties in which the frequency of uncontracted forms was considerably higher than that indicated by the total numbers for *Lindisfarne*, either as a general property of a specific variety or under certain conditions, depending on whether we are dealing with a change of scribes in an exemplar or with a change in the frequency with which one particular scribe used uncontracted forms. In section 3.3 we will see strong evidence that at least one such variety of OE indeed existed.

2.2.2. The Durham Ritual *gloss*

We have seen that the data from *Lindisfarne* are far from easy to interpret, but in spite of this they support Levin's claim. Let us now briefly look at the data from the second gloss written by Aldred, the *Durham Ritual* gloss (Table 7). Most of the forms gloss exactly what would be expected, so mismatches between the presence or absence of separate *ne* in the gloss and *non* in the Latin are found in both directions, i.e. contracted forms glossing *non* followed by forms of *esse* or *habere* and uncontracted ones glossing forms of *nescire*. This shows that, while it is entirely possible that the form of glosses was influenced by the Latin, there is again certainly no slavish dependence on it.

Table 7: negative contraction in the *Durham Ritual* gloss

	contracted	uncontracted	% uncontracted
beon	5	9	64%
habban	2	2	50%
willan	5	–	0%
witan	3	3	50%

The *Durham Ritual* data look reasonably similar to those found in *Lindisfarne*, and given the very low numbers involved for three of the four verbs, they are compatible with an assumption that the pattern is not substantially different. The identical percentages for *habban* and *witan* in the *Durham Ritual* data can be taken with a large pinch of salt—the more so given that the uncontracted forms of *witan* are all found within a few lines of each other, so that they are likely to have influenced each other.[19] Similarly, the complete absence of uncontracted forms for *willan* may well be accidental since there are only five instances. Notice that the only verb with sufficient numbers for a somewhat more reliable percentage figure, i.e. *beon*, has a frequency of non-contraction that closely matches the one found for *Lindisfarne*. On the whole, then, there is little reason to believe that the pattern found in the *Durham Ritual* is genuinely different from that in *Lindisfarne*, although the variation found within *Lindisfarne* of course complicates the issue—clearly the pattern does not look like that in *Luke*, but it is comparable to both the overall data for *Lindisfarne* as well as those parts of *Lindisfarne* that do not have an increased use of uncontracted forms.

2.2.3. Summary of the evidence from Aldred's glosses

For the two Nbr glosses written by Aldred, and *Lindisfarne* in particular, we can conclude that the Latin may well have influenced the rate of contraction to some extent, so it is likely that we are overestimating the frequency of uncontracted forms in the case of *beon* and *habban*,

[19] It is also possible that two of them should be regarded as involving *ah ne*, which is the Anglian equivalent of *hu ne*, and as we will see in section 3.2, negative contraction frequently fails in the case of *hu ne* questions in prose. However, given that the third one has *oððe* 'or' instead of *ah* and the Latin contains neither of the words regularly glossed with *ah ne*/*hu ne* (*nonne* and *numquid*), I think it is safe to regard them as *ah* 'or' followed by a negated verb form.

and underestimating it for *witan* and *willan*. Variation between different parts of *Lindisfarne* further adds to the difficulty of making an accurate assessment of the frequency of uncontracted forms in the dialect spoken by the glossator(s). However, any influence from Latin appears to have been limited, and there can be no real doubt that the use of uncontracted forms was significantly more common than in WS. The only possible exception to this involves *willan*. If the different parts of *Lindisfarne* reflect two or more distinct varieties of Nbr, then the frequency of non-contraction with this verb could have been quite low (possibly even non-existent) in one or more of them. On the other hand, if we are indeed dealing with evidence from more than one variety of Nbr in this gloss, then the frequency of non-contraction must have been very high in at least one of the varieties concerned, and uncontracted forms of *willan* were definitely found in this variety.

2.2.4. The Northumbrian glosses in the Rushworth Gospels

Before turning to the Mercian data, we will finish our discussion of the data from Nbr glosses by looking at the third surviving source of substantial length for Nbr. This source was not included in Levin's study, presumably for reasons that will become clear in a moment. The text involved, usually referred to as *Rushworth*^{2}, consists of the parts of the *Rushworth Gospels* glosses that were written by the scribe Owun in the late 10th century, and it is heavily dependent on the *Lindisfarne* gloss. As a result, data from *Rushworth*^{2} must be seen in relation to those from *Lindisfarne*. Where the two agree, this may not tell us anything more than that the scribe copied his source faithfully at that point. Disagreements between the two, on the other hand, can be more informative.

A check of all the contracted and uncontracted forms in *Lindisfarne* against the corresponding text in *Rushworth*^{2} shows that *Rushworth*^{2} in fact does not always follow *Lindisfarne* in its use of negative contraction. And while only a couple of forms are changed from uncontracted to contracted, changes in the opposite direction are common. At first glance that might seem to suggest a higher frequency of uncontracted forms in this variety. However, much of this is likely to involve modifications to give Latin *non* a separate gloss. Ogura (1999: 140) already notes that negative contraction is "rather rare" in *Rushworth*^{2} when Latin *non* is involved. A more detailed look at the data shows that all contracted forms of *habban* found in *Lindisfarne* are changed to uncontracted, with the sole exception of one present participle and this could be related to the fact that the Latin text in *Rushworth* is corrupt at that point: Lk (Ru) 3.11 Lat. *nonbenti* [for *non habenti*]. The same holds for nearly all contracted forms of *beon* in *Lindisfarne*; in some cases the result in *Rushworth*^{2} is not exactly an uncontracted form because of other changes, e.g. in word order or the form of *beon* used, but only four contracted forms of *beon* are retained (including the first two instances, as well as one that does not involve Latin *non*). Such changes could well be due to the influence of Latin *non*, but of course these data do not prove anything by themselves. It is the data on *willan* that settle the matter. Nearly all contracted forms of *willan* are retained, and one form is even changed from uncontracted to contracted: Lk 12.29 *nolite*, Li *ne wællað gie*, Ru^2 *nallað ge*.[20] Tellingly, however, the exceptions involve precisely the small number of instances where the Latin has *non* followed by a verb rather than a form of *nolle*.[21] So these differences between

[20] Mk 6.26 is another potential case. *Lindisfarne* has Latin *noluit* 'did not want' given in the margin as an alternative to *uoluit* 'wanted' in the main text, and this is glossed as *ne walde* whereas the main text has the gloss *walde*. *Rushworth*^{2} has the gloss *nalde* for the main text, but the Latin reads *uoluit* rather than *noluit*, so we would not expect a negative form here. It is not clear, then, whether the form given in the margin in *Lindisfarne* was changed to a contracted form in *Rusworth*^{2} or whether we are dealing with something else.

[21] Mk 11.26 *non dimiseritis*, Li *nallað forgeafa*, Ru^2 *ne wallas forgeofa*; Jn 5.40 *non uultis*, Li *nallas gie*, Ru^2 *ne wallas*; Jn 10.38 *mihi non uultis credere*, Li *ge naelle me gelefa*, Ru^2 *me ne wallað gelefa* (with the placement of the pronoun *me* here also matching the Latin more closely than in *Lindisfarne*). In the other instances where a contracted form of *willan* is used in *Lindisfarne* to gloss a phrase that involves Latin *non* and where the corre-

Rushworth^2 and *Lindisfarne* tell us little or nothing about any differences there may have been between the dialects of the scribes involved. Given the apparently strong influence of Latin *non*, the evidence for *beon*, *habban* and *willan* in *Rushworth*^{2} is essentially uninterpretable. The only thing we can say is that the absence of a correspondingly strong tendency to change uncontracted forms of *willan* to contracted ones when they gloss forms of *nolle* indicates that the scribe did not accept uncontracted forms of *willan* solely as a result of influence of Latin, but that still does not necessarily mean that he actively used such forms himself.

In the case of *witan*, however, there appear to be some changes from contracted to uncontracted forms that fall outside this pattern. While it is true that all instances of glosses of phrases involving Latin *non* that consist solely of a contracted form of *witan* in *Lindisfarne* are altered to uncontracted forms in *Rushworth*^{2},[22] there are also glosses of *nescire* that are changed from contracted to uncontracted.[23] The different behaviour of *witan* as compared to *willan* could indicate that the frequency of non-contraction was indeed noticeably higher in the case of this verb. It would then also suggest that non-contraction with *witan* was more frequent in this variety as compared to *Lindisfarne*, given that uncontracted forms glossing *nescire* are generally accepted by the scribe, but a number of contracted ones are changed.[24] However, it could equally well reflect a difference between the two Latin verbs involved: even though negation is incorporated into the verb in both cases, as already mentioned *nescire* is still transparently a negator (*ne*) attached to a verb (*scire* 'know'), which could account for the inconsistent treatment of glosses of *nescire*, whereas that is not the case for *nolle*.

The scribe of *Rushworth*^{2}, then, had a very strong tendency to match Latin *non* to OE *ne*, and he altered contracted forms found in *Lindisfarne* accordingly. Two exceptions to this are found right at the beginning of *Rushworth*^{2} (Mk 2.24 and Mk 2.26, both involving glosses of Latin *non licet*), so the scribe may not have adopted this policy immediately, but it quickly becomes highly regular: subsequently only the glosses for Lk 3.11 (involving a non-finite form as well as a scribal error in the Latin) and Jn 18.28 run counter to that rule by retaining contracted forms in spite of the presence of *non* in the Latin. He did not have a corresponding tendency to change uncontracted forms glossing forms of *nolle* or *nescire*/*ignorare* to contracted ones, so the influence of Latin *non* cannot explain all of the uncontracted forms in *Rushworth*^{2}. Given that these uncontracted forms are copied from *Lindisfarne*, however, they

---

sponding glossed passage is present in *Rushworth*^{2}, the contracted form is again avoided in *Rushworth*^{2}, even if it is not replaced with an uncontracted one. In the glosses for Mk 16.14 *non crediderant* and Jn 18.30 *non tibi tradidissemus*, *Lindisfarne* has alternate glosses, one of which matches the Latin word for word and another that adds a (contracted) form of *willan*; *Rushworth*^{2} adopts the gloss without a form of *willan*. In the final instance (Jn 21.18 *non uis*, Li *ðu nuilt*, Ru^2 *ne ðu wylt*), *Rushworth*^{2} again goes for a gloss that matches Latin *non* to OE *ne*, but because of the placement of the subject pronoun between *ne* and the verb, the result does not qualify as an uncontracted form.

[22] Jn 16.3 *non nouerunt*, Li *nutton*, Ru^2 *ne wutun*; Jn 20.14 *non sciebat* (the Latin has an abbreviated form of *non* in *Rushworth*), Li *nyste*, Ru^2 *ne wiste*. In the case of Jn 3.8, Jn 7.49 and Jn 10.5, all involving Latin *non*, *Lindisfarne* has pairs of alternates (one with *ne* followed by a form of either *witan* or *cunnan* and the other a contracted form). *Rushworth*^{2} retains both forms in Jn 7.49 and Jn 10.5, so one form matches Latin *non* to OE *ne*. In the case of Jn 3.8, only an uncontracted form (*ne wastu*) is given in *Rushworth*^{2}, but note that the corresponding Latin text reads *nescis* instead of *non scis*. Jn 8.55 is a still more complicated case: *Lindisfarne* has Lat. *non scio eum*, glossed as *ic hine nat*, whereas *Rushworth*^{2} has the gloss *ic ne wæt hine* (with the word order matching the Latin as well), but the Latin has changed *non scio* to *nescio*. In other words, it is not clear whether the selection of the uncontracted form from the pair of alternates in the case of Jn 3.8 and/or the change to an uncontracted form in Jn 8.55 happened under the influence of *non* in the Latin text of *Lindisfarne*, or whether they should be regarded as uncontracted forms glossing forms of *nescire*.

[23] The relevant instances can be found at Mk 13.35, Jn 4.22, Jn 9.29, Jn 9.30 and Jn 13.7.

[24] There is one case where *Rushworth*^{2} has a contracted form that is not found in *Lindisfarne*, although technically it probably is not a change from uncontracted to contracted since *ne* in *Lindisfarne* is likely to be an instance of the coordinator 'nor' here, given that it glosses Latin *nec*: Jn 14.17 *nec scit*, Li *ne uat*, Ru^2 *& natt*. I should point out that the Latin text in *Rushworth* has *nescit* here, which explains the contracted form.

do not necessarily tell us anything about the active language use of the scribe. The change of a number of contracted forms glossing *nescire* to uncontracted ones is potentially more informative and could indicate that uncontracted forms of at least *witan* were indeed found in the scribe's language and that he may have preferred them to contracted forms. But the fact that it involves a Latin verb that can be analysed into a sequence that would correspond to OE *ne* followed by *witan* means that this is uncertain, especially in the absence of any such changes involving the many glosses of Latin *nolle*. In short, the evidence from *Rushworth*^{2} adds very little to our knowledge about negative contraction in Nbr, which means that the *Lindisfarne Gospels* and *Durham Ritual* glosses remain our best sources of evidence here.

2.3. The data from Mercian glosses

Levin's data on Mercian were drawn from the *Vespasian Psalter* gloss and Farman's gloss of *Matthew* in the *Rushworth Gospels*, usually referred to as *Rushworth*^{1}.[25] The *Vespasian Psalter* gloss is dated to the 9th century, probably mid-century (Ker 1957: art. 203). The available evidence points to Canterbury as the place of production, but the language of the gloss is of course Mercian. According to Kitson (2002: 478), the language should probably be localised further south than Kuhn's earlier suggestion of Lichfield. Although it is the oldest extant OE psalter gloss, it derives from an earlier source (Sisam 1932: 325–326, n.8, Pulsiano 1996). Kitson (2002: 481–484) provides evidence that the original gloss was written in a different non-WS variety (possibly Nbr), so there is a possibility of interference from the dialect of a previous version. Even so, the language of the gloss is, as Kitson puts it, "famously nearly consistent" (2002: 477). However, the degree of scribal translation at one level need not match that of other levels; see Benskin & Laing (1981) on this in relation to ME. In other words, consistent or near-consistent scribal translation at the level of spelling, morphology and/or lexis does not entail that the syntax has necessarily been translated into the scribe's own dialect as well, so the possibility that our data may have been affected by the original gloss remains.

The other Mercian gloss used, *Rushworth*^{1}, was written in the late 10th century, so there is a substantial time gap between the two. The scribe of *Rushworth*^{1} may have had access to the *Lindisfarne Gospels* gloss, but the gloss to *Matthew* is very different from *Lindisfarne*, and it is almost certainly safe to treat it as independent from it for our purposes.[26] On the basis of a colophon in the manuscript stating that Farman was a priest "æt harawuda", it has usually been assumed that *Rushworth*^{1} was written in Harewood, although more recently alternatives have been proposed: Chester-le-Street (Ross 1981) and Lichfield (Coates 1997). See Hogg (2004b) for further discussion. So there is some uncertainty about the place where the gloss was written, but of course the language of the gloss is not necessarily representative of the place of production in any case, as *Vespasian* demonstrates (and so would *Rushworth*^{1} if written at Chester-le-Street). There is no disagreement that the language of *Rushworth*^{1} is a variety of Mercian.

In comparison to the Nbr glosses investigated in section 2.2, *Vespasian* is substantially earlier, whereas *Rushworth*^{1} is probably later, but not by much. This means that any differ-

[25] The glosses to *Mark* 1–2.15 and *John* 18.1–3 were also written by Farman, but following Levin's study, I have not included them.

[26] There is evidence for somewhat more influence from *Lindisfarne* on *Rushworth*^{1} from *Matthew* 26.7 onwards, but little of the data on negative contraction is found in this part and there is nothing to suggest in those five instances that *Lindisfarne* was exerting an influence on the use of negative contraction. Influence from *Lindisfarne* can certainly not be held responsible for the existence of uncontracted forms in *Rushworth*^{1}, given that even in that part of *Matthew*, *Rushworth*^{1} has an uncontracted form where *Lindisfarne* uses a contracted form (MtGl (Ru) 26.70 *ne wat ic* 'not know I', glossing *nescio*). For a discussion of the evidence for influence of *Lindisfarne* on *Rushworth*^{1}, see Ross (1979, 1981).

ences between the Nbr findings and those for *Rushworth*[1] would probably be due to diatopic variation rather than diachronic change, but the same does not necessarily hold for *Vespasian*; in the latter case either of these could be responsible, or indeed a combination of the two. Diachrony could of course also be a factor in any differences found between the two Mercian glosses.

We will examine the evidence from both Mercian glosses in this section, starting with the data from *Vespasian* in section 2.3.1. I will argue that the evidence from this gloss indicates that it was so heavily influenced by Latin that comparatively little can be said about the behaviour of negative contraction in this particular variety of Mercian. However, we will see that there are differences between the various forms of the verb *beon* that cannot be ascribed to Latin influence, so in all likelihood they reflect genuine differences between the forms involved. That conclusion is further confirmed by the data from *Rushworth*[1], discussed in section 2.3.2. Here we will find a very similar pattern of behaviour for the various forms of *beon*, but unlike in the case of *Vespasian*, there is no evidence to suggest that Latin exerted much influence on the use of negative contraction in the gloss. The data concerning *beon* will also be compared to those from the Nbr glosses to show that the same pattern is not found there. In addition, the data from *Rushworth*[1] provide us with evidence on the behaviour of negative contraction in this variety for the other verbs. As was the case for the Nbr data, they show that uncontracted forms were used more freely than in WS, although that statement needs to be qualified in view of the data on the behaviour of some forms of *beon*. Section 2.3.3 gives a brief summary of the findings.

2.3.1. The Vespasian Psalter *gloss*

As can be seen in Table 8, below, the data on negative contraction in *Vespasian* are very different from the Nbr data we saw in section 2.2. Although uncontracted forms are fairly common, they are all but limited to forms of *beon*; 26 out of 27 uncontracted forms involve this verb. There is no evidence for *habban*, although the fact that contraction is found with the one negated non-finite form of this verb in the text—PsGlA 5.3 *nabbende*, glossing Latin *non habens*—may suggest that contraction was probably not unusual. In the case of *witan* and *willan*, however, contraction is very much the rule.

Table 8: negative contraction in the *Vespasian Psalter and Hymns* gloss

	contracted	uncontracted	% uncontracted
beon	58	26	31%
eam	5	4	44%
eart	–	1	100%
is	53	1	2%
past	–	20	100%
habban	–	–	n.a.
willan	20	–	0%
witan	10	1	9%

It is of course possible that there simply were very marked differences between the verbs in this dialect, but given that in the case of negated forms of *witan* and *willan* we are normally dealing with glosses of a single Latin word, it is equally possible that the influence of the corresponding Latin is very strong in this particular gloss. Very suggestively, the one case of non-contraction of *witan* (PsGlA 80.5 *ne wiste*) involves a gloss of *non nouerat* 'not knew', whereas the contracted forms of *witan* are all glosses for forms of either *nescire* or *ignorare*. This substantially increases the likelihood that the gloss was indeed heavily influenced by the presence or absence of a separate negator in the Latin text. It is entirely possi-

ble, then, that uncontracted forms of *witan* and *willan* were not in fact rare or absent in the dialect of the glossator, in spite of their near-complete absence from the *Vespasian* gloss.

In the case of *beon*, where much more variation is found, this variation is far from free. As can be seen in Table 8, 3sg pres. *is* nearly always contracts with *ne*, 1sg pres. *eam* varies, and the past tense forms are consistently uncontracted, while the single occurrence of a negated form of 2sg pres. *eart* does not allow us to determine whether non-contraction is consistent or variable for that form. If the glossator was normally led by the Latin, then uncontracted forms must have been strongly resisted in the case of *is*, presumably to the point where they were very rare or absent in the dialect concerned. The variability in the case of *eam* would in that case also seem to point to a marked preference for the contracted form. The lack of contracted forms in the past tense could either mean that they did not contract in this dialect, or that contraction was found, but at a significantly lower rate than with *is* and *eam* so that there was not enough pressure to go against the default glossing procedure.

Notice that the original psalter gloss may have followed the Latin more consistently in the case of *beon*. The other two psalter glosses that belong to the same group as *Vespasian* (commonly referred to as the 'A-type' psalter glosses) have a higher number of uncontracted forms with *is* than *Vespasian*, even though they are both West-Saxonised versions. It is very unlikely that this should be taken as evidence that there was a higher frequency of non-contraction with *is* in the two varieties of WS concerned; we will see in sections 3.1 and 3.2 below that contraction is completely regular for this particular form in the (mostly WS) prose texts included in the YCOE, except in one syntactic context that inhibits the use of negative contraction. While it is possible that the uncontracted forms were introduced by WS scribes as a result of increased influence from Latin, it is more plausible that the common source of these three glosses should be held responsible for the uncontracted forms. The likelihood of this is increased by the fact that the *Cambridge Psalter* gloss has *ne ys* as the gloss of the first three instances of *non est* in the text only. After that, the contracted form is normally found, except for three instances of *na ys* (the first of which is also very early on in the gloss), and *ne ys* occurs as a gloss for *nec est* 'nor is' three times elsewhere in the gloss, as indeed it does in the other two A-type glosses in the same instances. The former suggests that <na> resists contraction, indicating that it is not a spelling variant of the negative particle *ne* here, but rather the adverb *na* 'not, not at all', and the latter confirms that those three cases should be treated as involving the coordinator *ne* 'nor', in which case contraction should of course not occur. The most straightforward explanation for the distribution of the uncontracted forms at the beginning of the text is that the scribe of *Cambridge* (or of a preceding version) started off by accepting *ne is*, but when he had settled into his task, he began to reject them systematically and replaced them with contracted forms, suggesting that the uncontracted form with *is* was not acceptable in his dialect.[27] In the third A-type gloss, the *Junius Psalter* gloss, the uncontracted forms are scattered through the gloss. One of the eleven cases in *Junius* coincides with one of the instances of *na is* in *Cambridge*, but otherwise they are all in different places in the gloss as compared to *Cambridge*, or even the single instance found in *Vespasian*. Given that *Junius* is likely to have replaced at least the first three instances (i.e. the ones surviving in *Cambridge*) with contracted forms, *Junius* probably did change uncontracted forms to contracted ones, but not as consistently as the other two A-type glosses.

It seems likely, then, that uncontracted forms with *is* were more widespread in the archetype than in any of the surviving A-type glosses, and that subsequent scribes had a tendency with various degrees of strength to replace them with contracted forms—most consistently in *Vespasian*, very consistently in *Cambridge* after the first six psalms, and more haphazardly

[27] There is no change of scribe in the manuscript involved. There *is* a change of hand, but it is at the end of the Psalm 1 (Ker 1957: art. 13), which precedes any of the relevant forms. Of course, I cannot rule out a change of scribe in an exemplar as an alternative explanation on the basis of just these data.

in *Junius*. The data are also compatible with the possibility that uncontracted forms might originally have been used consistently to gloss *non* followed by a form of *esse*, i.e. the glossing procedure may have been completely mechanical in the original gloss. The near-consistency with which *is* contracts in *Vespasian* could be a feature that was introduced by the *Vespasian* scribe and thus reflect his own usage. The possibility that it was already present in his exemplar can of course not be excluded, but even if that was the case, on the evidence of *Junius* and *Cambridge*, it would probably not go back as far as what Kitson labels the "immediate (Mercian) archetype of [the] A tradition" in his proposed stemma (2003: 32) and it seems unlikely that a version of the gloss introducing notable non-Mercian features might have intervened between *Vespasian* and such a Mercian archetype. Moreover, we will see shortly that *beon* appears to behave in a very similar way in our second Mercian gloss, *Rushworth*[1]. So although we cannot be sure that the *Vespasian* scribe was responsible for the near-consistency of contraction with *is*, it was probably a feature introduced in a Mercian version of the gloss.

The evidence from *Vespasian* is difficult to interpret, then, since there is a very high risk that the glossing process has affected the data severely. We can conclude on the basis of them that contraction with *is* was probably the rule, in which case its behaviour actually did not differ much, if at all, from that found in WS. The data also show that *eam* frequently contracted. However, it is much less clear to what extent non-contraction was found. It seems reasonably safe to conclude that uncontracted forms were at least acceptable with *eam*, since otherwise we would expect these forms to behave in the same way as *is* in the gloss. This holds even more so for past tense forms of *beon*; for these forms there appears to have been no pressure on the scribe to diverge from the Latin, suggesting that uncontracted forms were fully acceptable and therefore presumably not rare. And if uncontracted forms had been completely unacceptable in the case of *witan*, we would not have expected such a form to be used even as a gloss of *non nouerat*, given that it is not the case that the glossator always blindly follows the Latin; in particular, the data for *is* show that the glossator is prepared to go against the Latin almost consistently in some cases. However, that tells us little about the relative frequency of contracted and uncontracted forms, especially with only a single gloss of *non nouerat* to go on. Finally, all we can say about *willan* is that contracted forms were acceptable; there simply is no evidence that allows us to say anything about the existence or frequency of non-contraction with this verb. In other words, past tense forms of *beon* are the only forms for which we can be reasonably confident on the basis of these data that non-contraction was probably significantly more frequent than in WS. The data do not enable us to draw any conclusions about the other verbs or forms of *beon*, except that they suggest that uncontracted forms were at least acceptable with *eam*, *eart* and *witan*. And in the case of *eam* and *eart*, the occurrence of non-contraction actually gives us no contrast with WS even if it were frequent, as we will see in section 3.1—if anything, it is the occurrence of contracted forms that provides a contrast here.

2.3.2. Rushworth[1]

Compared to *Vespasian*, the data from *Rushworth*[1] seem much more straightforward and informative. Unlike in the previous gloss, both contracted and uncontracted forms are found with all verbs in *Rushworth*[1]. See the data in Table 9.

Table 9: negative contraction in *Rushworth*[1] (*Matthew*)

	contracted	uncontracted	% uncontracted
beon	28	8	22%
eam	2	–	0%
is	26	1	4%
past	0	7	100%
habban	9	8	47%
willan	7	5[28]	42%
witan	3	3	50%

This could be a difference between the two varieties of Mercian, of course, but more probably the main difference lies in the extent to which the glossator was led by the Latin, without excluding the possibility of differences between the two varieties as well. I can see no specific indications that the glossator of *Rushworth*[1] was influenced significantly by the presence/absence of a separate negator in the Latin. In fact, it would have been surprising if the data on negative contraction had been strongly influenced by the Latin, given that this particular gloss takes a remarkable degree of liberty with the Latin to the extent that alterations of word order in the gloss are not uncommon. For example, in (6a) the word order is modified in the gloss to make the negator *ne* adjacent to the finite verb, which is of course where it should be in OE. The exact word-by-word gloss found in *Lindisfarne* is given in (6b) for comparison. Although the possibility of some Latin influence cannot be excluded, I think any potential impact on the data will have been very limited in the case of *Rushworth*[1].

(6) a. . . . ne wæs swæ (OE) \ non sic fuit (Lat.)
not was so not so was
'was not so'

(MtGl (Ru) 19.8)

b. . . . ne suæ wæs
not so was

(MtGl (Li) 19.8)

Notice, incidentally, that the modification of the word order in (6a) produces an uncontracted form. If the resulting uncontracted form had not been acceptable to the glossator, it would have been strange that he failed to change it to a contracted form; after all, he had already chosen to depart from the Latin in a more radical way by moving the gloss of *fuit*. This suggests that the glossator had no problems with the uncontracted form in (6a). Compare (7), where the contracted form is used in a case that involves a similar word order change. That does not necessarily mean that the glossator had a problem with an uncontracted form in the case of (7), of course, since he could simply have chosen to use the contracted variant here if either variant was possible. We will see in a moment, though, that he probably *did* have a problem with the corresponding uncontracted form in this particular case.

(7) nis dead . . . (OE) \ non mortua est (Lat.)
not-is dead not dead is
'is not dead'

(MtGl (Ru) 9.24)

[28] This includes the instance in MtGl (Ru) 18.30. The Dictionary of Old English Corpus has *na wolde* whereas the printed edition has *ne wolde*, and the latter reading is confirmed by a facsimile of the manuscript.

As can been seen from Table 9, negative contraction was variable in *Rushworth*[1] for all four verbs, and uncontracted forms were frequent with *habban*, *willan* and *witan*. In the case of *beon*, however, we again find that the variation is largely determined by the form of the verb. As in *Vespasian*, contraction is near-consistent in the case of *is*. Contraction is also found with *eam*, but with only two instances (both contracted), it is not possible to say whether it was (near-)consistent or variable. Nothing at all can be said about 2sg *eart*, given that there are no relevant forms. The past tense forms of *beon*, on the other hand, do not contract, again matching the pattern found in *Vespasian*. Given the numbers involved it is of course possible that contraction occurred at a relatively low frequency with past tense forms of *beon*, but the contrast with *eam* and especially *is* is clear. The data from *Rushworth*[1], then, support our earlier interpretation of the data on *beon* from *Vespasian*, indicating that this particular pattern of behaviour with *beon* may have been a feature of (certain varieties of) Mercian.

Interestingly, this pattern is not found in the two Nbr glosses examined earlier. In those glosses, all the forms of *beon* that occur more than once show variation; see Table 10, below. If anything, *is* appears to resist contraction in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* gloss—contraction is found in just 22% of instances—whereas the other forms show a more even distribution between contracted and uncontracted forms.[29] The same appears to hold for the *Durham Ritual*, to the extent that the very low numbers allow such conclusions. So frequent lack of contraction with *is* and highly variable contraction of past tense forms of *beon* would be consistent with a dialect feature of at least some varieties of Nbr that would contrast with at least some varieties of Mercian.[30] I do not see any way in which these differences between the two pairs of glosses could be ascribed to differences in glossing practice; the frequency of uncontracted forms of *beon* may be overestimated in any or all of them and to varying degrees, but the different behaviour of the forms of *beon* would still need to be accounted for.

Table 10: negative contraction with *beon* in the *Lindisfarne* and *Durham Ritual* glosses

	Lindisfarne			*Durham Ritual*	
	contracted	uncontracted	% uncontracted	contracted	uncontracted
am	11	13	54%	1	1
art	1	–	0%	–	–
is	16	57	78%	2	5
aron	3	2	40%	1	1
past	18	27	60%	1	2

There is one parallel between the Nbr and Mercian data in terms of the behaviour of forms of *beon*, though: both sets of data indicate frequent contraction with 1sg pres. *eam*/*am*. So in that respect they both contrast with WS, where this form usually does not contract (see section 3.1). Lack of sufficient data for Mercian and Nbr makes it impossible to judge whether the same is true for 2sg *eart*/*art*, which patterns with the 1sg form in WS, but given that one of only two relevant forms occurring in the four Anglian glosses is contracted, it is cer-

[29] The preference for uncontracted forms with *is* is not the result of most relevant instances occurring in *Luke* and/or the later parts of *Mark* where contraction is rare for all forms of *beon* (see Table 4, above); in both *Matthew* and *John*, uncontracted forms also predominate for *is* (very clearly so in the case of *Matthew*, with 5 contracted forms against 18 uncontracted forms). The slight preference for uncontracted forms in the past tense of *beon*, on the other hand, may well be the result of the high frequency uncontracted forms in *Mark* from 5.40 and *Luke*.

[30] In the case of the variety of Mercian represented in *Vespasian*, contraction may of course have been highly variable with past tense forms as well since the apparent lack of variation could be the result of the glossing procedure. But even if so, we can still safely assume that contraction was significantly less frequent than with *is*.

tainly a possibility. In the absence of more data, though, the only thing we can say with certainty about the 2sg pres. of *beon* is that contraction with this form is attested in *Lindisfarne*.

2.3.3. Summary

We have seen that the data from Mercian glosses (especially *Rushworth*^{1}) support the idea that, generally speaking, negative contraction is more variable here than in WS. However, they also show that there are differences as compared to the Nbr data and that not all forms of *beon* behave in the same way. Most notably, it appears that contraction with *is* was almost as regular in these varieties of Mercian as in WS. Indeed, taking into account the possibility of Latin influence, it may have been completely regular, particularly in the case of *Vespasian*. In contrast, this definitely does not hold for the Nbr data, where *is* is the least frequently contracted form of *beon*. In addition, past tense forms of *beon* resist contraction more strongly than other forms of *beon* in the Mercian glosses, which again does not seem to be the case for the Nbr data.

On the other hand, both the Mercian and the Nbr data indicate that contraction of 1sg pres. *eam*/*am* is frequent in these varieties. In this respect, they both contrast with WS, where non-contraction is the norm for this particular form of *beon*. Interestingly though, the contrast is reversed from what might have been expected, given that generally speaking non-contraction is very rare in WS and more common in Anglian. It is possible that the same holds for 2sg pres. *eart*/*art*, but the scarcity of relevant forms in the Anglian glosses makes it impossible to prove more than that contraction at least occurs in one of them.

Furthermore, the discussion of *Vespasian* showed that the data from this gloss were in all likelihood heavily affected by Latin influence, underlining the importance of taking into account the possible effects of Latin in the case of data taken from glosses rather than simply taking the numbers at face value. The next section will further illustrate this point.

2.4. More on psalter glosses

We saw in sections 2.2 and 2.3 that the data on negative contraction in the Anglian glosses indeed indicate that non-contraction occurred more widely in Anglian than in WS, in spite of the likelihood that the glosses have been affected by the influence of Latin to varying degrees. In this section we will primarily be concerned with a discussion of the evidence from a different gloss, the *Salisbury Psalter* gloss, which leads on to some discussion of other psalter glosses. The reason for focusing on *Salisbury* specifically is that it has recently been used as a source of evidence for negative contraction by Hogg (2004a) to argue that in at least this particular variety of WS non-contraction was common, so that it is not the case that negative contraction is close to consistent in all varieties of WS. However, I will show that Hogg's conclusion is unwarranted because the uncontracted forms can be attributed to other factors.

The *Salisbury Psalter* gloss was added to the manuscript in the period transitional between OE and ME—Ker (1957: art. 379) dates it to the late 11th to early 12th century, while Sisam & Sisam (1959: 14, 28) settle on the beginning of the 12th century.[31] According to Sisam & Sisam (1959: 28) "The gloss was probably copied at Shaftesbury . . . and it is basically late West Saxon". Hogg (2004a: 466) points out that this localisation places it at "the very center of historical Wessex". In spite of this, Hogg finds that 50 out of 57 instances (i.e. 88%) of negator + *is*, *wæs* or *wæron* in the *Salisbury* gloss do not contract. On the basis of these data, he draws the conclusion that WS varieties did not uniformly avoid non-contraction.

[31] Most of the gloss to the hymns in the same manuscript was written by the same scribe, but the gloss to one of the hymns is much earlier: late 10th century (Ker 1957: art. 379). In what follows, I will confine myself to the psalter glosses.

It will probably be clear by now that there are a number of things that could provide alternative explanations for the high number of uncontracted forms found in this gloss. Although Hogg briefly discusses and dismisses two of them, the data from *Salisbury* are not inspected more closely in his article, so that is what we will be doing here. We will start with the possibility that the form of the negator used in *Salisbury*, i.e. <na> rather than <ne>, prevented or inhibited negative contraction (section 2.4.1). We will find that there is some evidence to support such a claim in principle, but it seems unlikely that it is the explanation for the frequent failure of contraction in the case of *Salisbury*, since <na> appears to be used as the normal spelling for *ne* in this gloss rather than necessarily representing the more emphatic adverb *na*. The second possibility raised by Hogg is Latin influence, which is the topic of section 2.4.2. In this case I will argue that Hogg was wrong to dismiss it as easily as he did; the evidence indicates that the uncontracted forms are in all likelihood the result of glossing Latin *non*. Next, we will consider the possibility that the uncontracted forms in *Salisbury* were copied from an exemplar by taking into account evidence from other psalter glosses (section 2.4.3). A look at the distribution of the uncontracted forms in *Salisbury* provides further indications that this is likely to have been the case. Finally, we will return briefly to one of the other psalter glosses (*Eadwine's Canterbury Psalter*) in section 2.4.4, because it is the only psalter gloss that has uncontracted forms which cannot be attributed to influence from Latin. We will see that non-WS influence is a plausible explanation for those forms. A brief summary is given in section 2.4.5.

2.4.1. The form of the negator

The first point mentioned by Hogg as a potential explanation for the uncontracted forms found in *Salisbury* concerns the form of the negator used in that gloss. Given that *Salisbury* typically uses *na* rather than *ne*, he raises the possibility that the rareness of contraction could be due to a higher degree of stress on *na* than on *ne* preventing contraction (Hogg 2004a: 466). However, he points out that this would not explain why contraction sometimes *did* occur. He adds data from the *Regius Psalter* gloss, which, like *Salisbury*, prefers *na* over *ne*, but nevertheless tends to use contracted forms (44 out 53 instances, i.e. 83% contraction).

I do not think that these facts necessarily argue against the idea that contracted forms are normally not variants of *na* + verb in OE. We have already seen in section 2.3.1 that in the *Cambridge Psalter* gloss, instances with *na* were the only ones to survive past the point where otherwise contracted forms were used consistently with *is*, indicating that it certainly could resist contraction. Moreover, *na* does not appear to behave in the same manner as *ne* in at least some of the D-type psalter glosses, which is the group of psalter glosses that *Salisbury* belongs to. Ogura (1999: 133) implies in her abstract that if a subject pronoun is inserted in the gloss where the Latin has none, it typically comes in between *na* and the finite verb, whereas in the case of *ne* it is typically inserted before *ne*. Her data in the main text of the article do not show this clearly because they include all instances with *na* or *ne* adjacent to the finite verb rather than separating out those involving an inserted subject pronoun, but the pattern definitely exists. A rough count of the glosses for Latin *non* + verb that involve added subject pronouns in the *Regius Psalter* gloss indicates that the tendency is strong in this gloss. I found only one example where the subject pronoun intervenes between *ne* and the verb against thirteen instances with the order pronoun–*ne*–verb. In the case of *na*, on the other hand, the order pronoun–*na*–verb is sporadic after the first five examples in the gloss (all of which have that order); after this point, I counted just seven instances, compared to 115 cases where the pronoun separates *na* from the verb. So *na* and *ne* do not behave the same syntactically in this gloss. Whereas instances involving *ne* tend to behave in the same way as verbs negated with *ne* normally do in OE in terms of adjacency to the finite verb, the same is not true for *na*—*na* is behaving more like a word that has no particular connection with the verb

(as indeed it does not in OE), in which case we should not expect negative contraction to function normally when *na* is used. The fact that *Regius* nevertheless tends to use negative contraction suggests a very strong dislike of anything that looks like an uncontracted form (even if, technically, it is not). This holds especially for *is*, which contracts more consistently in *Regius* than past tense forms of *beon* (92% against 60% according to my counts).

In spite of all this, I am inclined to believe that the use of *na* is unlikely to have been a major factor in the case of *Salisbury* specifically. It may have helped preserve the uncontracted forms in preceding versions, but the evidence that *na* behaves differently from *ne* in *Salisbury* is not as clear as in *Regius*. Although it is true that in the majority of cases where a subject pronoun is inserted in a gloss of Latin *non* + verb, this pronoun is found between *na* and the verb (I counted 35 instances), there are 11 examples where the pronoun precedes *na*. In addition, I found 11 cases where the pronoun is inserted after the verb, again keeping *na* adjacent to the verb (an order which occurs in *Regius* as well, but with only 4 examples it is sporadic there in comparison to the more than a hundred instances in which *na* is not kept adjacent to the verb in that gloss). And there were another 6 cases where *na* was repeated, so that one instance occurred before the pronoun and another before the verb (a phenomenon which is only found once in *Regius*). So while it is not the case that *na* is normally kept adjacent to the verb in *Salisbury*, equally there is no clear tendency for it to be separated from the verb by an inserted pronoun in this gloss. In addition, there are virtually no data on *ne* to compare it with because this form is so rare in *Salisbury*; there is just one relevant instance, which has the order with *ne* adjacent to the verb. Moreover, *Salisbury* has a very strong preference for the form <na> rather than <ne> even in cases involving the coordinator 'nor', indicating that <na> was the normal spelling for *ne* in *Salisbury* (both for the negative particle 'not' and for the coordinator 'nor') since the adverb *na* 'not, not at all' is not a possibility in the case of the coordinating use. Consequently it is uncertain for any given instance whether <na> negating a verb should be regarded as an instance of *na* or *ne* in *Salisbury*. This means that the use of that particular form is much less likely to have been an inhibiting factor on negative contraction in this gloss.

2.4.2. Latin influence

A more plausible explanation for the uncontracted forms than the one discussed in the previous section is influence from Latin, which will come as no surprise after the evidence from *Vespasian* in section 2.3.1. Hogg considers the possibility, but assumes it could "only be taken so far" and speculates that, at most, it might mean that the 'real' frequency of uncontracted forms was closer to 50% than to the 88% actually found in the gloss (Hogg 2004a: 466). With only data on forms of *beon*, however, we cannot assess how strong or weak Latin influence is likely to have been. If Latin influence is the explanation, then obviously what we expect to find is that in cases where negation is incorporated into the Latin verb, negative contraction will be used in the OE gloss. And that is precisely what happens: contraction is completely regular in this gloss with both *witan* and *willan*, and all the forms concerned gloss single words in the Latin, i.e. *nescire/ignorare* or *nolle*. The only instance where we do not find a contracted form involves non-adjacency and a non-finite verb form, and it matches the Latin—*na god wyllende* 'not God willing', glossing *non deus uolens*—so contraction would not have been expected here for several reasons. (There is no relevant evidence for *habban*, as the only instance is a (non-contracted) non-finite form.) So the situation in *Salisbury* is very similar to the one found in *Vespasian*, except that contraction is unusual for all forms of *beon* rather than just the past tense ones.[32]

[32] There is no indication that the various forms of *beon* behave differently in *Salisbury*, except maybe that *eom* does not contract at all, but the numbers are very low and non-contraction with *eom* is normal in WS anyway, so there would have been no pressure on WS scribes to use a contracted form.

The uncontracted forms in *Salisbury*, then, can be explained as the result of Latin influence, since uncontracted forms are strictly limited to cases where Latin *non* is involved. The predominance of non-contraction for *all* forms of *beon* in fact increases the likelihood that we are dealing with a by-product of glossing practice rather than anything that reflects a property of the dialect concerned: all the indications are that outside of Nbr, non-contraction of *is* is vanishingly rare. We saw in section 2.3 that even the Mercian glosses only had one instance each, and we will see in section 3.1 that contraction with *is* is effectively consistent in all the prose texts included in the YCOE, most of which are of course written in WS. The fact that uncontracted forms with *is* are frequent in *Salisbury* should make us very suspicious about the validity of taking uncontracted forms in this gloss as evidence for the behaviour of negative contraction in the scribe's dialect. The idea that some variety or varieties of WS might have had a high frequency of non-contraction with *is* is simply not plausible in view of the available evidence.

2.4.3. Copying practice as an alternative or additional explanation

Salisbury is a copy rather than an original gloss, so it is necessary to consider the possibility that the uncontracted forms were copied from an exemplar, which means that we need to look at the evidence from other psalter glosses. As said earlier, it belongs to a group of psalter glosses referred to as 'D-type', and non-contraction of forms of *beon* (often including *is*) is in fact not uncommon in most other D-type psalter glosses. See also Ogura (1999: 134–135), who shows that contracted forms are rare in glosses of Latin *non* + V in several of the WS psalter glosses. However, the gloss to *Eadwine's Canterbury Psalter*, which is not a straightforward D-type gloss, is the only one I have seen that gives any evidence of non-contraction with either *witan* or *willan* where this cannot be explained on the grounds of either influence from Latin (e.g. *ne wiste* as a gloss for *non nouerat*) and/or other factors favouring non-contraction, which will be discussed in section 3 (e.g. *Hu ne witon* glossing *Nonne scient*). We will come back to *Eadwine* in the next section. But as far as non-contraction in D-type glosses is concerned, all the evidence suggests that we are probably dealing with a feature which goes back to the archetype and was the result of a mechanical procedure for glossing *non*. In all likelihood the normal gloss was *na* rather than *ne*, given how common *na* is in D-type psalter glosses; see Ogura (1999) for data on this. So the uncontracted forms found with *beon* in *Salisbury*, as in other D-type psalter glosses, are probably the consequence of the glossing process (at least in origin) and/or the use of an exemplar which contained uncontracted forms. And in all likelihood it was a combination of the two in most or all cases.[33]

The small number of contracted forms in *Salisbury* could have slipped in against a normal practice of faithfully transcribing the exemplar and/or glossing Latin *non* with *na* precisely because of a very strong tendency to use negative contraction with these verb forms. Notice that for the five contracted forms in *Salisbury* glossing Latin *non* + a form of 'be' (PsGlK 103.25 *nis*, 141.5 *næs*, 143.3 *nis*, 145.3 *nis* and 146.5 *nis*), the D-type *Arundel* psalter gloss has *na* followed by the verb in four cases and *ne is* is found for the fifth, while uncontracted forms are also found for at least four of these instances in the D-type *Vitellius* psalter gloss (the fifth is illegible). So these contracted forms in *Salisbury* may well involve changes of an original gloss of *na* (or *ne*) + verb.[34]

[33] For a recent discussion of the relations between the various psalter glosses, see Kitson (2002, 2003).

[34] One of the remaining two contracted forms in *Salisbury* (PsGlK 106.12 *næs*) involves a gloss of *nec fuit* 'nor was', where we would not have expected contraction to occur given that the coordinator *ne* 'nor' is not subject to negative contraction. It is surprising, then, to find that no fewer than four other D-type glosses (*Regius*, *Vitellius*, *Tiberius* and *Lambeth*) also have a contracted form here. This form must go back to a common source. The final instance, PsGlK 134.17 *na nis soþlice is*, glossing *neque enim est* 'nor truly is', is an additional and negated form of *is* which is neither matched by the Latin nor by any other D-type gloss, so it looks like an innovation.

Furthermore, the contracted forms of *beon* are not evenly distributed in *Salisbury*: they are not used in the first hundred or so psalms at all, but cluster in the final part of the gloss, especially after psalm 140, where we find four contracted forms against two uncontracted ones. Such a distribution is more easily attributed to a change in copying practice (becoming less *literatim*) and/or glossing practice (allowing more deviation from the Latin) than to any sudden change in frequency with which the scribe used negative contraction in his normal language. A change of scribe in the exemplar could of course also account for such a distribution, but notice that Sisam & Sisam (1959: 26) point out that in terms of spelling a change between the beginning and later parts of the gloss can be observed as well. They conclude on the basis of the spelling evidence that "the scribe seems to have followed his model more closely when he started copying, and to have introduced his own transitional spellings more and more as he went on". That supports the idea that the copying practice of the scribe changed towards being increasingly less faithful and closer to the scribe's own language as the work progressed. If the *Salisbury* scribe indeed increasingly changed uncontracted forms to contracted ones in the later part of the gloss, that would confirm that the consistently uncontracted forms of *beon* found in the first part of the gloss are in fact unrepresentative of his own language.

As far as the evidence from *Salisbury* is concerned, then, there is nothing to force a conclusion that the high frequency of uncontracted forms of *beon* found in it reflects a property of the dialect that the gloss, or its source, was written in. Although it is difficult to completely rule out any possibility that they might be a characteristic of the dialect concerned, all the indications are that they are much more convincingly explained as a product of a mechanical glossing procedure that goes back to the common source for D-type glosses. So these data give us no good evidence for claiming that there was a variety of central WS in which non-contraction was frequent.

There is one way, though, in which the uncontracted forms could possibly be attributed to dialect. Some scholars believe that D-type psalter glosses were not completely independent from the A-type ones and that both types go back to, or were at least influenced by, the original gloss that was the source of the A-type glosses (see Kitson 2002: 475–476, 485–488 for discussion and further references). If correct, the uncontracted forms found in the D-type psalters could potentially go back to influence from that original gloss. This would not necessarily be through copying of each individual form; the influence could also have been on the glossing strategy adopted for Latin *non*. But if that original gloss was written in Nbr, as Kitson (2002: 482–483) tentatively suggests, dialect would become a more plausible explanation for a frequent use of *ne is* than it would be otherwise; as we saw in section 2.3.2, there is nothing to suggest that uncontracted forms were avoided with *is* in the Nbr glosses, and the discussion in sections 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 indicated that it was very unlikely that such uncontracted forms were solely the result of Latin influence in the case of Aldred's glosses. However, if dialect were the only explanation, we would also expect that the archetype would have contained uncontracted forms of *witan* and/or *willan* glossing forms of *nescire*/*ignorare* and *nolle*, since non-contraction would in all likelihood also have been found with those verbs in the dialect concerned, especially in the case of *witan*. It would be surprising in that case that not even one of the three A-type psalter glosses has preserved any such forms. It seems more likely that the uncontracted forms are at least primarily the result of glossing procedure, irrespective of whether such uncontracted forms were in fact normally found in the dialect of the glossator, although full acceptability of the forms in the dialect concerned would presumably have made it easier for a glossator to adopt such a strategy.

2.4.4. The gloss to Eadwine's Canterbury Psalter

Before concluding our discussion of psalter glosses, we need to return briefly to the gloss to *Eadwine's Canterbury Psalter*. As mentioned in the previous section, *Eadwine* is the only psalter gloss that contains uncontracted forms that cannot be ascribed to Latin influence. The gloss was written in the mid 12th century at Canterbury (Ker 1957: art. 91). It probably involves use of both the *Vespasian Psalter* and the *Regius Psalter* as exemplars (see especially Kitson 2003: 21ff), but note that even the use of the Mercian *Vespasian* would not account for glosses like *ne wiste* 'not knew' for *nescivi* (PsGlE 72.22) and *ne woldon* 'not wanted' for *noluerunt* (PsGlE 77.10); as we saw in section 2.3.1, *Vespasian* consistently has contracted forms in such cases. Notice in addition that the Latin verb *noscere* 'get knowledge of' is treated as negative in this gloss, so that *noverunt* 'got knowledge of' is translated as *ne witon* 'not knew' (PsGlE 118.79), and *non noverunt* and *non noverat* as *ne ne witon* 'not not knew' (PsGlE 78.6) and *ne ne wyste* (PsGlE 80.6), respectively. *Eadwine* is (in)famous for its many blunders—see the remarks by e.g. Kitson (2003: 20) and Sisam & Sisam (1959: 57)—and this looks like a case in point. Such errors are clearly innovations as compared to both *Vespasian* and *Regius*, while non-contraction in glosses of *noscere* cannot be attributed to any influence from Latin, so it looks as if these uncontracted forms must reflect the language of the glossator(s)/scribes involved.[35] In view of the place of production, Kentish influence is a likely suspect, and according to Kitson (2002: 478, fn.11) there are definitely late south-eastern characteristics in the language of the gloss. In addition, the date of the manuscript falls outside what is normally regarded as the OE period. In other words, the uncontracted forms in *Eadwine* should probably be regarded as Middle Kentish.[36]

2.4.5. Summary

I can see no good evidence in any of the psalter glosses to support Hogg's suggestion that non-contraction may have been frequent in some varieties of (central) WS. A word-by-word glossing procedure in combination with faithful copying provides a more plausible explanation for the attested uncontracted forms in *Salisbury*. The same holds for all other D-type glosses, except for *Eadwine*, which is not straightforwardly D-type. Depending on whether D-type glosses are related to A-type glosses or not, dialect might conceivably be involved as well, but in that case we would be dealing with Anglian influence, plus Latin influence would in all likelihood still be a major factor. As for the uncontracted forms found in *Eadwine* which cannot be attributed to Latin influence, these are probably Middle Kentish.

[35] According to the information given in Ker (1957: art. 91) and the notes in the edition (Harsley 1889), PsGlE 72.22, 77.10 and 118.79 involve the main scribe, and PsGlE 78.6 and 80.6 a second scribe. None of these uncontracted forms involve the corrector (who was highly active in the part of the gloss up to Psalm 78). Other relevant cases: 38.7 *he ne wæt* for Latin *ignorat* (main scribe), and arguably 87.6 *ne wære witende* 'not were knowing' for Latin *non meministi* (second hand), where the Latin has *non* but the form of *beon* does not correspond to the Latin. So two different scribes are responsible for the uncontracted forms (as well as the erroneous glossing of *noscere*), unless of course we are dealing with a faithfully copied gloss.

[36] That explanation is not available if *Eadwine* is in fact a copy of a much earlier gloss, as O'Neill (1992), Berghaus (1979) and Wildhagen (1905) believe, but see Kitson (2003: 22–24) for counter-arguments. However, they also believe that this hypothesised earlier gloss, including its mistakes, was the work of a Mercian scribe (Berghaus 1979: 63, Wildhagen 1905: §§120–123). In other words, if they are right, the uncontracted forms could be regarded as Anglian. So either way, we are unlikely to be dealing with WS forms.